# Handguns for Huns AC

## Part 1 is Inherency

#### The NRA uses fear mongering and victimization to scare women into buying handguns, reinforcing gender norms for profit. Glick 15:

Glick, Susan. (Violence Policy Center Health Policy Analyst) "Female Persuasion Executive Summary." Violence Policy Center. N.p., 12 Aug. 2015. Web. 30 Mar. 2016. <http://www.vpc.org/publications/female-persuasion/>. BS

In the early 1980s handgun sales in the United States—as measured by production— slumped dramatically. The firearms industry soon realized that the drop stemmed from saturation of the primary market of white males. Manufacturers then did what any industry does under such circumstances: first, they redesigned their product line to resell the white-male core market; second, they worked to develop new markets, with the primary focus on women.¶ As part of this approach, the firearms industry presents female handgun ownership as one more male bastion falling to women’s equality. Arguments against ownership are portrayed as a patriarchal attempt to deny women their freedom.¶ The primary marketing tactic, however, is not equality, but fear. The pitch to women is simple: You’re a woman. Some stranger is going to try and rape you. You’d better buy a handgun. People buy handguns out of fear and stranger rape—it is theorized—is what women fear most. As a result, the gun lobby has been relentless in its use[s] of fear of rape to promote handguns as self-defense weapons.¶ Female Persuasion has two goals: to explore the reality of women and firearms violence in light of these new marketing trends; and, to act as a resource and catalyst to involve women and advocacy organizations in the firearms violence debate.¶ In 1989 Smith & Wesson of Springfield, Massachusetts became the first firearms manufacturer to offer a line of self-defense handguns designed especially for women. The company’s LadySmith program targeted women with handguns that “manage to be elegant without sacrificing any of their practicality.” Since then, Smith & Wesson has gone on to become the leader in marketing handguns to women. Other companies that have targeted women include Beretta USA, Davis Industries, Derringer USA, and Lorcin Engineering.¶ While in their mainstream advertising manufacturers present this marketing shift as the manifestation of a natural concern for women’s safety, in industry publications this pretense is abandoned. An ad that appeared in Ladies Home Journal for the “All-American” 9mm pistol produced by Colt’s Manufacturing Company, Inc. of Hartford, Connecticut features a presumably single mother tucking her beaming child into bed. A Raggedy Ann doll is in the little girl’s hands. The headline states, “Self-Protection is more than your right… it’s your responsibility.” The same advertisement appears as the centerpiece of a second ad that appeared later in the industry trade journal SHOT Business. Above it the headline reads: “You Might Think This Ad is About Handguns. It’s Really About Doubling Your Business.” The text of the industry ad observes:¶ Women represent 53% of America’s population. And here at Colt, we believe that addressing women’s security needs is not only a responsible and necessary objective, it’s also smart business. When this ad ran in a national women’s magazine, it seized nationwide media attention. More important, it gave Colt and its products top-of-mind awareness in a huge and largely untapped market. Today, Colt is making every effort to seek out and capture new markets for our products, and we welcome the fact that women are now a growing and entitled segment of the firearms market. As potential customers, they must not be ignored. And as a responsible voice in this firearms industry we will continue to address this market and expand your opportunities to serve their needs.¶ In a rare candid admission by a gun manufacturer representative, Judy Eberhart, Winchester’s manager of dealer services, told American Firearms Industry magazine:¶ We know the women’s firearms market is growing by leaps and bounds. There’s a big demand for self- defense and home protection…and there’s a lot more single women out there who need that information. Hunting is not a growing sport and there aren’t more lands being set aside for hunting, so what we’ve got in that area is in danger of shrinking. Self-defense, however, illustrated best by the recent trouble in California [riots] and Florida [Hurricane Andrew] is uppermost in peoples’ minds.¶ Complementing women’s firearms is a wide range of women’s “accessories” such as specialized purses, waist bags (fanny packs), holsters, and belts to aid in concealed carrying. Not surprisingly, each month, Women & Guns magazine, a monthly publication catering to female gun owners and owned by the pro-gun Second Amendment Foundation, is replete with ads for such products. Yet, according to the National Rifle Association’s 1994 “Compendium of State Laws Governing Handguns,” 36 states have laws that either make it difficult to obtain carry permits or that ban concealment entirely. The question as to whether these products are being sold only to women who are legally carrying handguns was answered in a 1994 Women & Gunsreader survey. The survey reported that 91 percent of the magazine’s readers agreed that, even if doing so were illegal, they would carry a handgun if they felt threatened.¶ The industry recognizes the importance of educating dealers on the intricacies of catering to female customers. In the last two years the industry journals Shooting Industry and SHOT Business have added specialty columns on women and firearms. Each column carries a similar message: Try not to treat women like they are stupid. Apparently a message that bears repeating, the April 1994 Shooting Industry column coaches retailers on the sensitivity required in selling self-defense handguns through the purse-snatching saga of a prospective customer:¶ If a woman like Rebecca walks into your store to purchase a self-defense weapon, don’t make her feel like an idiot for not doing it sooner. Just telling you her story will probably be enough to bring tears to her eyes. All she wants from you is reassurance that she’s doing the right thing.¶ Recognizing the mutual benefits increased gun ownership would offer to all members of America’s firearms lobby, pro-gun organizations have worked with the industry to develop new self-defense and sporting programs for women. Lobbying organizations that have worked to both scare and entice women into buying handguns include the National Rifle Association of America and the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms. They have been aided on the national level by the National Shooting Sports Foundation and its recently founded sister organization, the Women’s Shooting Sports Foundation.¶ The cover of the NRA pamphlet [says] A Question of Self-Defense offers a chilling quote against a black, blood-spattered background. “‘Tell them what rape is. Be graphic. Be disgusting. Be obscene. Make them sick. If they throw up, then they have the tiniest idea of what it is!’—Boston rape victim.” Anecdotes contained in the pamphlet are written in lurid, graphic detail. A key component of the pitch is the assumed isolation of women. The message is clear— not only is a stranger going to try and rape you; no one will be there to help you. Your last and only hope is a gun.¶ A second NRA pamphlet, It Can Happen to You, opens to a drawing of an unsuspecting, elderly woman. Written from the female perspective (an earlier edition had been gender-neutral), the pamphlet warns:¶ In nature, the predator preys on the weak, the sick, the aged. It stalks. It waits patiently for the precise moment when the victim appears defenseless. Then, it strikes… [T]here is no way of telling a criminal predator by the way he looks. He might be a potential suitor.¶ The marketing tactics employed by the industry and pro-gun organizations are based on time-honored myths regarding violence against women. Section Two of Female Persuasion looks at four common myths used to market firearms to women versus the reality of violence against women and the role firearms play.

#### Gun advertising perpetuates gender norms. 3 warrants, Tyler 13:

Bishop, Tyler. (BA in Political Science,)"Women and Guns: Hidden and Apparent Subordination in the Gun Debate." 12/6/2013 BS

A host of empirical evidence points to conclusion that “guns” are a masculine¶ topic. A look at the marketing practices of gun companies paints a clear picture of this¶ conclusion. In an advertisement appearing in a publication produced by the National¶ Association for Gun Rights in 2012, Bushmaster appealed to a male[s] audience with the¶ slogan “Consider your man card reissued,” printed next to an image of a large semiautomatic¶ gun. The same publication featured an ad with the slogan “Mama didn’t raise a¶ victim,” printed over a woman pointing a handgun. The first advertisement plays to the¶ desire of many men to maintain a “manly” persona, displaying the perception of guns¶ acting as a masculinizing element (Blair & Hyatt 1995). The second ad, on the other¶ hand, attempts to appeal to women by suggesting that guns can empower women to avoid¶ victimization—a completely different strategy. This distinction sheds some light on both ¶ 6¶ the masculine ties to guns themselves and the ways in which the association is used in¶ rhetorical appeals.¶ Further empirical evidence reflecting the masculine perception of guns lies in the¶ fact that [2.]men own guns at a higher rate than women. David Bugg and Philip Yang studied¶ the gender differences in gun ownership from 1973 to 2002, concluding that gun¶ ownership among women hovers in the 30 percent range, while gun ownership among¶ men hovers around 50 percent (2011). Trends published jointly by Pew Research and¶ Gallup in March of 2013 show that the gender disparity in gun ownership found in¶ Buggs’ study still exists today. The sheer difference in the ownership of guns is both a¶ product of, and a reinforcing factor in the public perception of the ties of guns to¶ masculinity (Bugg 2002). Additionally, Geralyn Miller, Linda Murphy and Thomas¶ Stucky conducted a study in 2008 centering on the influence of gender on legislative¶ preferences, finding that [3.]female representatives generally are more likely to fall on the¶ side of gun control, another reinforcing factor of the association of guns to masculinity.¶ The marketing of guns, trends in gun ownership and the legislative preferences of female¶ legislators, though all can be complicated by important caveats, all principally point to¶ the conclusion that “guns” are perceived as a masculine topic. This concept is significant¶ in the gun control debate because it provides a framework through which we can¶ understand how and why female voices are devalued on masculinized topics.

#### Handguns are key in this context

Volokh 09 summarizes

Eugene, prof @ UCLA, “IMPLEMENTING THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS FOR SELF-DEFENSE: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND A RESEARCH AGENDA”, UCLA LAW REVIEW 1443, 2009 LHS

And the Court’s explanation of why the handgun ban is unconstitutional even if long guns are allowed is likewise consistent with an inquiry into how substantially a law burdens the right to bear arms:¶ It is no answer to say, as petitioners do, that it is permissible to ban the possession of handguns so long as the possession of other firearms (i.e., long guns) is allowed. It is enough to note, as we have observed, that **the American people have considered the handgun to be the** quintessential self-defense weapon. **There are many reasons that a citizen may prefer a handgun** for home defense: **It is easier to store in a location that is readily accessible in an emergency; it cannot easily be redirected or wrestled away by an attacker; it is easier to use for those without the upper-body strength to lift and aim a long gun; it can be pointed at a burglar with one hand while the other hand dials the police.** Whatever the reason, **handguns are the most popular weapon chosen by Americans for self-defense** in the home, and a complete prohibition of their use is invalid.49¶ The Court is pointing out that handguns are popular for a reason: For many people, they are the optimal self-defense tool, and bans on handguns make self-defense materially more difficult. **The handgun ban**, then, **is a material burden on the right to bear arms** in self-defense.

## Part 2 is the Plan

#### I advocate the USFG ought to ban private ownership of handguns. RRTC

#### I accept negative links and competition based on fair interpretations of the resolution. I will only de-link strategies if I prove they are based on unfair interps. Mitigates any DA to whole rez since it puts a burden on me in a time-pressed 1AR to prove you’re unfair first. Also, neg has no stable advocacy for aff prep, so it’s unreciprocal for the aff to meet an advocacy burden regarding spec or fiat. I will make concessions given the stipulations above.

#### The gun industry fans the flames, they profit from anti-gun control measures and they channel their money into lobbying efforts, damaging the industry decreases the money the NRA has. Stone 13

Stone, Peter H. (Stone has covered a wide array of lobbying and campaign finance issues in Washington. Spent a decade in New York freelancing for paper such as The New York Times, The Washington Post, and Newsday and magazines including The Atlantic, The Nation, and New Times. Stone studied modern European history at the University of Chicago. Hallman is senior editor for projects and investigations at The Huffington Post, based in New York.) "NRA Gun Control Crusade Reflects Firearms Industry Financial Ties." The Huffington Post. Ed. Ben Hallman. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 11 Jan. 2013. Web. 04 Apr. 2016. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/11/nra-gun-control-firearms-industry-ties\_n\_2434142.html>. BS

Throughout its 142-year history, the National Rifle Association has portrayed itself as an advocate for the individual gun owner’s Second Amendment rights. In turn, the NRA relied on those gun owners, especially its 4 million or so members, to pressure lawmakers into carrying out its anti-gun control agenda.¶ In the last two decades, however, the deep-pocketed NRA has increasingly relied on the support of another constituency: the $12-billion-a-year gun industry, made up of manufacturers and sellers of firearms, ammunition and related wares. That alliance was sealed in 2005, when Congress, after heavy NRA lobbying, approved a measure that gave gunmakers and gun distributors broad, and unprecedented, immunity from a wave of liability lawsuits related to gun violence in America’s cities.¶ It was a turning point for both the NRA and the industry, both of which recognized the mutual benefits of a partnership. That same year, the NRA also launched a lucrative new fundraising drive to secure “corporate partners” that’s raked in millions from the gun industry to boost its operations.¶ But that alliance, which has grown even closer in recent years — and includes ties both financial and personal, a Huffington Post examination has found — has led to mounting questions from gun control advocates about the NRA’s priorities. Is the nation’s most potent gun lobby mainly looking out for its base constituency, the estimated 80 million Americans who own a firearm? Or is it acting on behalf of those that make and sell those guns?¶ According to a 2012 poll conducted by GOP pollster Frank Luntz for Mayors Against Illegal Guns, 74 percent of NRA members support mandatory background checks for all gun purchases, a position that the NRA has stridently opposed. “There’s a big difference between the NRA’s rank and file and the NRA’s Washington lobbyists, who live and breathe for a different purpose,” Mark Glaze, the executive director of the gun control group, said.¶ The questions about the NRA’s ties to the gun industry, and whether those ties have influenced its agenda, have come to the forefront in the wake of horrific mass shootings last year in Connecticut, Colorado and Wisconsin.¶ A week after a gunman killed 20 children and six adults in a Newtown, Conn., school, Wayne LaPierre, the NRA’s executive vice president and top lobbyist, gave a tense, combative performance at a press conference in which he signalled the organization wouldn’t budge from its long-held opposition to most gun control measures.¶ Instead, LaPierre revealed that the NRA favored putting thousands of armed guards in schools to curb shootings. “The only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun,” he said.¶ The NRA’s deep ties to the gun industry dismays some lawmakers who have introduced gun control bills responding to the mass shootings.¶ “The NRA is basically helping to make sure the gun industry can increase sales,” Rep. Carolyn McCarthy, a New York Democrat and longtime gun control advocate, told The Huffington Post. McCarthy last week proposed a bill that would ban new sales of new large ammunition clips that increase the lethality of weapons like those used in mass shootings in Connecticut, Colorado and Wisconsin.¶ “No one is challenging NRA members’ right to own guns,” McCarthy said. “We’ve had large mass shootings which have [involved] large mass assault weapons clips. These clips aren’t used for hunting.”¶ McCarthy’s husband and five other people were shot dead in a brutal assault in 1993 on a New York commuter train by a man wielding a gun with a large-capacity ammunition clip.¶ The Obama administration is reportedly considering a much broader approach to curbing gun violence: bans on assault weapons and large ammunition clips, mandatory background checks on all gun purchases, increased mental health checks and expanded penalties for carrying guns near schools. On Wednesday, Vice President Joe Biden said that the White House had determined that “executive action can be taken,” though the specifics have not been settled.¶ The administration is also trying secure backing from big retailers like Walmart that sell guns, with an eye to undercutting the influence of the NRA and gun industry allies — a strategy that might peel off some of their gun-owner grassroots. Walmart leaders announced this week that they will attend a Thursday meeting at the White House.¶ Gun control advocates who have lagged badly behind the NRA in fundraising and organization are now are accelerating their efforts. On Tuesday, former Arizona Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D), who was badly wounded two years ago in a mass shooting, launched a new gun control political action committee, Americans for Responsible Solutions, to counter the NRA’s legendary financial and political clout with Congress.¶ The NRA declined to comment. In recent years, it has argued that defending gun owners and the gun industry is one in the same. Any new laws or regulations that would limit the availability of firearms, or restrict who can own them, would violate the Second Amendment, the organization has said. The NRA has said it does support efforts to keep guns out of the hands of felons, those who have been adjudicated as mentally incompetent, or unsupervised children.¶ The NRA forwarded a letter to The Huffington Post that the group sent to Congress. The letter is signed by Chris Cox, who runs the NRA lobbying arm. “We know that the facts prove gun bans do not work and that is why they are not supported by the majority of the American people,” the letter said. Cox promised that the NRA would adopt a “constructive” stance in the debate, and reiterated past NRA positions that existing laws need to be better enforced.¶ In 2011, 32,000 Americans died due to gun violence. The homicide rate in the U.S. is about 20 times higher than in other advanced nations.¶ ‘YOUR FIGHT HAS BECOME OUR FIGHT’¶ Close ties between the NRA and gunmakers go back at least to 1999, when the NRA publicly declared its support for the firearms industry as it prepared to defend itself from a rash of liability lawsuits filed by cities and municipalities.¶ “Your fight has become our fight,” then-NRA president Charlton Heston declared before a crowd of gun company executives at the annual SHOT Show, the industry’s biggest trade show. “Your legal threat has become our constitutional threat,” he said.¶ Following the passage of the shield law that dismembered those lawsuits, the NRA launched a new fundraising drive targeting firearms companies the organization had just helped in a big way. That effort, dubbed “Ring of Freedom,” paid off handsomely. Since 2005, the NRA drive has pulled in $14.7 million to $38.9 million from dozens of gun industry giants, including Beretta USA, Glock and Sturm, Ruger, according to a 2011 study by the Violence Policy Center, a group that favors gun control.¶ The Violence Policy Center study cited an NRA promotional brochure about the corporate partnership drive, noting that LaPierre promised that “this program is geared towards your company’s corporate interests.”¶ Despite the millions of dollars it has collected from the gun industry, the NRA’s website says “it is not affiliated with any firearm or ammunition manufacturers or with any businesses that deal in guns and ammunition.”¶ Besides its heavy lobbying for the special legal protections for gunmakers and distributors, the NRA pushed successfully in 2004 to ensure that a 10-year ban on assault weapons, enacted in 1994 over strong NRA objections, wasn’t renewed. Since then, annual rifle production by U.S. gunmakers has risen by almost 38 percent, according to federal gun data.¶ “The NRA clearly benefits from the gun industry,” William Vizzard, a former agent with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, told The Huffington Post. “There’s a symbiotic relationship. They have co-aligned goals much more than 30 or 40 years ago.”

#### Gun bans destroy the industry. Murphy 15

Murphy, Jason. (Murphy is an Economics Tutor The University of Melbourne) "Why the Gun Industry Has US over a Barrel." NewsComAu. N.p., 09 Dec. 2015. Web. 09 Apr. 2016. <http://www.news.com.au/finance/business/why-the-gun-industry-has-us-over-a-barrel/news-story/e4b72289e90b5ceda7778208410d1d99>. BS

THE United States is probably stuck with its guns. They are such a big part of its economy, the country simply can’t afford to give them up.¶ Australia can be very proud and very happy we have not allowed our country to go down the American path, where a mass shooting happens every few days. If you were designing a system to make it impossible to get rid of guns, you’d probably just copy the US.¶ But the American gun industry is thriving. There are already 300 million guns in US and the nation makes another 10 million a year — from the smallest pistols to the beefiest shotguns. America is also a big market for foreign makers.¶ Each year 3 million guns are imported from around the world to be fired — or just admired — in the US.¶ The gun industry is rich. It provides good jobs paying good money in factories and firing ranges all over the country. It grew like a weed — even during the global financial crisis and the subsequent economic bust.¶ So it is no surprise the share price of gun makers, such as the famed Smith & Wesson company, are in rude health.¶ Plenty of those riches made by the industry end up in the hands of two organisations: the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation.¶ Money makes them powerful. The NRA has an annual budget of about $US250 million. It spends $15 for every $1 spent by the gun control lobby and has them on the run. The NRA rates US politicians for how strongly they are committed to the right to own guns, and politicians fear a bad rating.¶ Idaho Governor Butch Otter jokes that “Our idea of gun control in Idaho is to use two hands”. Republican presidential candidate Ben Carson said, “I never saw a body with bullet holes that was more devastating than taking the right to arm ourselves away”. Dr Carson, mind you, is a medical doctor.¶ US gun culture depends on the second amendment to its constitution, which says “the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed”.¶ The idea back in 1791 was that people could rise up and overthrow the government if necessary. Warplanes and tanks hadn’t been invented then but, when they were, people did not get access to them. So the idea that owning guns keeps the government in line is way out of date.¶ The fight now is about which guns to make available to the public. Former US president Bill Clinton banned military-style assault weapons in 1994, but the ban expired in 2004.¶ Barack Obama has had little success in tightening gun access so far. Some say he is on the brink of a breakthrough now. But the history of the gun lobby suggests he is probably not.¶ Gun bans are not good for the gun industry, but fear of gun bans is. After every example of a mass shooting, gun sales go up. People want them for protection and fear they won’t be able to get them.¶ This is where the horror of guns really hits home. If they really only were used for hunting, only hunters would need guns. But guns are used for killing people.¶ When you go to the website of a company like Glock, you find a lot of small, affordable weapons being marketed for “self-defence”.¶ Over at Smith & Wesson, you can buy a gun for $US449. (The cheapest new gun I could find on the internet was a Cobra Freedom FS for $130. But a gun fan recently picked up another Cobra model for just over $100, and gave it 2.5 stars.)¶ If you have more to spend for just $559 you can buy a large semiautomatic weapon.¶ Costs just $US559¶ Guns may be cheap, but gun violence is expensive. The costs of gun violence are hidden — they don’t always look like costs. They look like jobs for disability support workers, for trauma surgeons, prison officers and undertakers.¶ But if the violence wasn’t there, people would not have to buy those services, either directly or through taxes. Taxes could be lower. The rest of the economy would do better and the US overall would be far better off.¶ The costs of gun violence are hundreds of billions of dollars a year according to one study — higher than obesity and almost as high as smoking.¶ We work on most other dangerous problems in society. Like cars. They keep getting safer. In the US, the big differences between guns and cars is that cars are regulated for safety by the consumer products authority. Guns are not.¶ The American gun lobby has spent a lot of money to keep it that way. The more shootings that happen, the more Americans will want guns, the richer the industry gets. On and on it goes.

## Part 3 is Framing

#### The ROB is to reject gendered marketing

#### We must develop pedagogies that specifically isolate and attack marketing and media practices that reinforce oppressive norms. Niccolini 15

Niccolini, Alyssa D. (Niccolini is a prof @ Department of English Education, Teachers College, Columbia University) "Reassembling Feminism." Rev. of Postfeminist Education? Girls and the Sexual Politics of Schooling. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education 36.3 (2015): 464-72. Taylor and Francis. Web. 31 Mar. 2016. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01596306.2014.892661>. BS

Ringrose (2013) argues that we are witnessing a rise in ‘sensationalized media¶ headlines [that] play[s] on our emotional investments, cultivating affect – a sense of moral¶ outrage and fear over changing forms of femininity, particularly disruptions to the status¶ quo’ (p. 30). The postfeminist dynamics she explores in her book, particularly where¶ women are perceived as overly or aggressively successful, mean, and/or sexy, and thus in¶ need of corrective curricula and pedagogies, are certainly at work in this ad. Its¶ interpellative ‘you would have’ reveals a complex moral topography that invokes¶ precisely the neoliberal discourses of choice and of risk, Ringrose investigates in her own¶ studies on postfeminist girlhood. She explains that ‘individualization and risk [are]¶ defining features of advanced capitalist society where the subject becomes defined though¶ their capacity to safeguard against risks as part of market competition (financial, social,¶ etc.)’ (p. 3).¶ Neatly quantifying ‘excess’ (two drinks), the ad positions the woman as a poor reader¶ of risk, and thus in need of her public shaming and moralizing pedagogy. ‘The neoliberal ethos is to change, to transform, to adapt, to reinvent, and to self-perfect toward the goal of marketability and consumption’, Ringrose explains:¶ and this logic transfuses the dynamic of education and learning more generally, including¶ self-help, spirituality, new age, fitness and health make-over genres, which hold specific¶ pedagogical dynamics around perfecting the self. (Ringrose, 2013, p. 4)¶ Through these invocations of choice and poor risk-assessment, there is an implicit¶ message that the drunken woman is ‘asking for’ sexual assault.¶ Part of the discourses of ‘slut shaming’ that Ringrose investigates in her book, the ad[s]¶ works to check unregulated female bodies. In its own promiscuous circulation within a¶ mobile public space it ironically enfolds the ‘modern’ and ‘liberated’ women in age-old¶ regulatory discourses around female mobility. Although the woman’s neat and professional¶ attire suggests a careful attempt by the ad designers to stymie associations between¶ dress and sexual risk, her business-casual also insinuates the dangers haunting¶ ‘empowered women’. Her ambiguous race further raises questions about which bodies¶ are considered ‘risky and “at risk”’ (p. 27) particularly within biopolitical conceptions of¶ populational health (and NYC has a history of racially and socioeconomically targeted¶ public service ads for obesity and diabetes, for example). In its various iterations, these¶ curricula assure the NYC citizenry that the government cares about their health and¶ welfare, and they can best serve the state by caring for themselves. Yet although the ad¶ accosts a seemingly narrowly defined ‘you’ – a certain ‘irresponsible’ gendered and¶ ambiguously raced citizen – its pedagogy also works to (re)educate the general subwayriding¶ public about female impropriety stoking ‘public anxieties that certain forms of¶ behavior are “deviant” and post a menace to the social order’ (p. 4). Here it is the ‘gender¶ order’ (Connell, 1987) that is at risk.¶ Positioned in plexiglass cases that usually display advertisements for commercial¶ products, the woman’s intoxicated body and (mis)behavior can be read at-a-glance and¶ easily ‘consumed’ by the subway-riding public. As Ringrose and Walkerdine (2008)¶ argue, neoliberalism has resulted in ‘an intensification of feminine as site (both subject¶ and object) of commodification and consumption’ (p. 230). This sharply attired woman¶ has certainly failed as a free-market ‘chooser’ (Ringrose, 2013, p. 3) having ‘consumed’¶ too much according to the copy in the ad, and she becomes the embodiment of an¶ inevitably ‘failing’ female subject (p. 91). In its masculinized counterpart, a bloodied man¶ is told that with two drinks ago he could have walked away from a bar-room brawl. In the¶ seconds it takes to take in these ads, ‘the gender order’ (Connell, 1987) is firmly reentrenched¶ where, as Ringrose explores in her book, ‘the feminine is set against a neutral,¶ normal male version of aggression’ (p. 32). Invoking postfeminist sensibilities, which the¶ ad insinuates, that women invite risk when they misuse their gained empowerment and¶ public mobility and men can become violent when alcohol tampers with masculine¶ rationality (‘Stop drinking while you’re still thinking’). It is quite easy to see how¶ postfeminist discourses might travel from public pedagogies into educational policies and¶ practices and how the ‘processes of “mediasation” where media and educational policy¶ mutually inform one another’ (p. 7) gain traction.

#### This is more than just “cap bad” or “gender norms bad,” marketing presents a unique issue of capitalist motivations to use psychological manipulation that enforces gender difference. Annamma & Venkatesh 94

Joy, Annamma, and Alladi Venkatesh.(Annamma works at the Department of Marketing, @ Concordia University and Venkatesh works @ the Graduate School of Management, for USC.)

(Received March 1992) "Postmodernism, feminism, and the body: The visible and the invisible in consumer research." International Journal of Research in Marketing 11.4 (1994): 333-357. BS

In the third and final theme, Bardo argues that advertising [ads] must be considered more than purely profit-maximizing and ideologi­cally neutral. It must be considered a general ideology that services the cultural reproduction of gender difference and gender in­equality. Increasingly, advertisements for diet products construct representations of women's subjective relations with food. A slender body may be attainable through hard work, but a 'cool' relation to food is a tantalizing reminder of what lies beyond the reach of the inadequate and hungry self. These im­ages are representations and reproducers of culture. A careful reading of contemporary advertisements reveals continual manipulation of problems that psychology and popular media have identified as characteristic dilem­mas of contemporary women, who have con­flicting role demands and pressures on their time. The use of a male figure in advertising is one method for representing compulsive eating as natural. Men are supposed to have hearty, voracious appetites. When a male figure is used in the ad, the grim actualities of women's eating problems remain obscured. When women are positively depicted as voracious about food, their hunger is a metaphor for their sexual appetite. Food is constructed as a sexual object of desire, and eating as more than a nutritive activity - as a worthwhile, sensuous and erotic experience in itself - is given a new legitimacy. ¶ The metaphors presuppose an idealized (rarely actualized) gendered division of labor in which men strive, compete, and exert themselves in the public sphere while women are sheltered in the domestic arena (which transcends the laboring body). To make this division of labor seem natural, there is yet another ideology which underlies the cultural containment of female appetite-the idea that women are most gratified by feeding and nourishing others, not themselves. Thus, there is a long history of women preparing food and men consuming food in advertising. Advertisements showing men preparing or serving food highlight the exceptional nature of the occasion. Food is equated with mater­nal and wifely love throughout our culture. Contemporary advertising offers a model for disorders related to food and hunger. By representing unrestrained appetite as inap­propriate for women and depicting female eating as a covert and transgressive act, the denial of hunger is embedded as a central feature in the construction of femininity. The compensatory binge thus becomes the virtual inevitability. The social control of female hunger also operates as a discipline that trains female bodies in the knowledge of their limits and possibilities. Thus denial of food becomes the important 'micro-practice' in the education of feminine self-restraint and containment of impulse.

#### This issue is a flashpoint for the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy, even empowering representations of women as forwarded by advertisements result in neoliberal victimization. Wilson 11

Wilson, Kalpana. (Wilson is a fellow in transnational gender studies at the LSE Gender Institute, and also teaches development studies at Birkbeck, University of London.)"‘Race’, Gender and Neoliberalism: Changing Visual Representations in Development." Third World Quarterly 32.2 (2011): 315-31. Taylor and Francis. Web. 11 Apr. 2016. <http://courses.arch.vt.edu/courses/wdunaway/gia5524/wilson11.pdf>. BS

As we have seen, contemporary ‘positive’ visual representations of women in¶ the South produced by development institutions are rooted in a notion of¶ ‘agency’ consistent with—and necessary for—neoliberal capitalism. These¶ ‘new’ constructions contribute to, rather than subvert, racialised regimes of representation.¶ While earlier representations persist, critiques of the essentialisation of¶ people in the South—and of women in particular—as passively suffering¶ victims have been widely interpreted as an imperative to represent these¶ women as universally enterprising, productive and happy. These ‘positive’¶ images are consistent with the current neoliberal[ism] development consensus¶ which, as we have seen, portrays an intensification of labour applied by¶ women in the South as the ‘solution’ to poverty [and] as well as gender inequality.¶ They operate in the same way as the images of ‘contented and productive’¶ women workers in colonial enterprises used in British advertising in the late¶ 19th and early 20th centuries: to reassure the viewer of the legitimacy and¶ justice of existing relationships and structures. These connections and¶ continuities are evident in a regime of representation in which the bodies of¶ ‘poor’ women in the global South continue to be racialised and exoticised¶ even as the construction of these women as hyper-industrious entrepreneurial¶ agents is incorporated in this process.¶ Agency as it is portrayed here is not only limited to the ‘rational self interested’¶ individual but is further constrained in the context of the [to] power¶ relations which structure these visual encounters: agency, like empowerment,¶ is projected as a gift to be granted by the consumer of the images—and¶ potential donor—implicitly reaffirming the civilising mission. Thus the notion of victims to be saved which these images supposedly challenge is not in fact eradicated but reworked. This interdependency between constructions¶ of ‘women in the developing world’ as both objects of transformation and¶ redemption and potential entrepreneurial subjects echoes the structure of¶ colonial discourses of salvation, which simultaneously infantilised its¶ objects and imposed a moral responsibility for self-improvement on them.¶ Mirroring representations of women workers in ordered colonial enterprises,¶ these ‘new’ images imply that, through the intervention of¶ development institutions, women in the South can be both ‘rescued’ from¶ oppressive and ‘backward’ societies and ‘civilised’ through subjection to the¶ discipline of global markets. Like their colonial predecessors, today’s¶ images work to silence or obscure multiple forms of resistance to¶ contemporary imperialism.

#### Media practices translate into manipulation of women’s identities and is the biggest form of wide-scale cultural reinforcement and can result is psychical violence and dehumanization, this impact comes first. Chapman 11

Chapman, Taylor M. (Chapman graduated in 2014 with a concentration in Psychology from Cleveland in Shelby, NC.) "Women in American Media: A Culture of Misperception." 3.7 (2011): 1. Student Pulse. Web. 5 Apr. 2016. <http://www.studentpulse.com/articles/548/women-in-american-media-a-culture-of-misperception>. BS

American culture is saturated with messages propagated by mass media. What was originally created for encouraging consumerism is now being promoted to a society that is being consumed by the messages themselves. Mass media is especially harmful to women because it constructs negative perceptions of women and reinforces them on a daily basis. Actions employed by the media are not always what they seem, but instead they act as catalysts for dangerous effects on women and society as a whole. This paper will address the tools used by media against women and will analyze the consequences of their use.¶ Mass media is a potent tool used to influence its audience in many ways, although most people would like to believe that they are not affected by advertising. This is because “advertising’s influence is quick, it’s cumulative, and for the most part, it’s subconscious” (Killing Us Softly). The standard that advertising creates affects women deeply and it is absolutely inescapable. According to Rosalind Gill, “we live in an era of 360 degree branding” (75). Advertisements are found on televisions, buses, on the sides of buildings, and in the magazines people read. Gill also stated that she “was concerned with the ‘currency’ of adverts- the way in which they permit the meaning of one thing to be expressed in terms of another,” because it suggested a direct correlation between someone’s worth as a person and that of owning a specific product or looking a certain way (49). Although “the media are hardly hypodermic needles injecting a passive and unsuspecting culture” with messages that people accept openly and willingly, they certainly help[s] to shape the most important aspects of being human, like “our identities, our dreams, our hopes, our ambitions, and our fears” (Douglas 18). Mass media affects each member of society because its reach is vast, its bite is quick, and its message seeps into the very fibers that are woven together to create a culture of misperceptions about women.¶ Indeed, it is the effect that the mass media has on a person’s identity that is most profound because without an identity, a person’s value lessens in a culture made up of consumers serving as the target audience. The message that advertisements are quite literally sending out is that people are equivalent to the products they purchase. These products “are given an exchange value,” and the descriptions of these products “are translated into statements about who we are and who we aspire to become” (Gill 50). This turns a person’s identity into a product, instead of a composite of thoughts and feelings, in an attempt to turn human worth into that of what can be found in a store. The effect of this is that a person’s actual identity and the way that person is [they are] perceived by others becomes skewed. This endangers people because society regards these messages about what people are and what people should be as absolute truths, instead of culturally constructed standards of what it means to be successful (Murray). Identity is the heart of humanity. When identity is taken away from people or is transformed into a thing, their humanity is subsequently stripped from them.¶ While the media attempt to target every person, the level of exposure is dictated by gender, and the majority of harmful messages are focused more toward women. For instance, in media such as magazines where a person relies on an image to relate a feeling, girls are often made to look inferior. Jean Kilbourne notes that “the body language of girls is usually passive, vulnerable, and very different from the body languages of boys and men.” This perpetuates the idea of weakness in women “whereas men are given dignity and strength” (Killing Us Softly). Even more significant is that while media are larger for women, they attempt to make women’s value and worth smaller. Gill states that “there are clear differences in the kinds of touch that women and men in adverts employ.” She goes on to say that men’s touch is used for purpose, such as reaching out to grab products or building and creating. Women’s touch, however, is “light and caressing and often seemed to have no purpose at all” (79-80). This type of media is what Theresa de Lauretis refers to as “technologies of gender” which means that “the representation of gender is its construction” (12). In other words, the way women are perceived is not necessarily truthful. They are seen a certain way, because they are made to be seen that way (Mendible 7). This fallacy perpetuated by gender-divided media affects women more harshly because women are more harmfully depicted than are men.¶ Being a woman in America’s media-obsessed culture also means living up to the beauty standard that advertisers set in place. Being beautiful is, in American society, the most important role a woman should fulfill. Naomi Wolf believes “beauty is a currency system like the gold standard” (3). The products that were previous determinates of self-worth become second to that of beauty. This is incredibly problematic because “’beauty’ is not universal, or changeless, though the West pretends that all ideals of female beauty stem from one Platonic Ideal Woman” (Wolf 4). Furthermore, media couples the idea of beauty with that of morality. The reason for this can be found within television shows and movies. Sharon Hayes and Stacey Tantleff-Dunn found that good characters are generally attractive and kind, whereas the concept of evil is linked with “cruelty and general unattractiveness” (415). Subsequently, these beauty ideals are “internalized, rationalized, and socially legitimized.” Meaning women are simultaneously being told that they are only valued for their beauty, “yet beauty codes make clear that most women do not measure up aesthetically” (Johnston and Taylor 954). Toni Raiten-D’Antonio claims “by adding these moral assumptions to the evaluation of a person’s appearance, we amplify the shame they are supposed to feel” (111). Beauty in reality is subjective, but the mass media constructs and upholds a narrow standard for what it means to be beautiful. Therefore, mass media is no longer solely attacking the product choices that consumers make, but also the consumers themselves.¶ In lieu of beauty being so highly regarded, women are expected by society to adhere to the beauty standard. When women do not naturally fit the standard or do not constantly strive to fit the standard, they are considered to have failed themselves, and most often, are told that they should be ashamed. Although, “no one is marched off for electrolysis at the end of a rifle…the disciplinary practices of femininity produces a ‘subjected and practiced,’ an inferiorized, body. This system aims at turning women into the docile and compliant companions of men” (Bartky 75). Yet there have been “vitriolic attacks in press and magazines on women who fail to live up to increasingly narrow normative requirements of feminine appearance” (Gill 2). This requirement, in turn, forces women to give up parts of themselves. Susan J. Douglas writes:¶ We can play sports, excel at school, go to college, aspire to – and get – jobs previously reserved for men, be working mothers and so forth. But in exchange, we must obsess about our faces, weight, breast size, clothing brands, about pleasing men and being envied by other women. (16)¶ The standard is already so small that the majority of women cannot meet the requirement set forth for them, and when they fail, they must absolve themselves with shame.¶ As these standards become increasingly narrow, it is important to note that there is yet another category of women who are affected negatively by the media. Jean Kilbourne states that “it’s an impossible ideal for just about everyone, but it’s absolutely impossible for women who aren’t white. Women of color are generally considered beautiful only if they approximate the white ideal” including “tamed hair,” lighter skin tone, and “white” facial features (Killing Us Softly). As this idea is perpetuated, there is a “constant disavowal of one’s own flesh.” (Murray). Furthermore, women of color are stereotyped and depicted in ways where they “are not individuals; rather they are projected as characters and a mass of body parts for males’ consumption” (Stephens and Phillips 42). An example of this is in cocoa drink advertisements where “representations of women of African origin frequently play on themes of ‘darkness’ and sexuality…in which both the woman and the drink are signified as ‘hot chocolate’” (Gill 79). There is also a trend among advertisers where women of color are “often featured in jungle settings wearing leopard skins as if they were exotic animals” (Killing Us Softly). Instead of allowing these women dignity and humanity, the media are presenting them as dessert drinks and an entirely different species from what they are. Mendible refers to this as a “convenient fiction” where bodies of color “function within a social and cultural taxonomy that registers but an echo of the clamor, complexity, and variety of women who embody” them (1). Therefore, the media are denying many women of color a chance for acknowledgement, while telling the women of color who are mentioned that they are equivalent to products instead of people.¶ Another way in which the media categorically strips women of their humanity is when these women are a living embodiment of what the media deem as ugly, disgusting, or wrong. Perhaps one of the most fitting examples today is when a woman is fat. Not only is fat an immediate determinate for ugliness by the media, but it is also cause for being stripped of one’s personhood completely. “In short, the fat body is discursively constructed as a failed body project” (Murray). Being fat is stigmatizing for all people, but it brings on a slew of new requirements for women. Not only is the fat body seen as “ugly” but it is also seen as something that needs to be controlled. Samantha Murray recounts a personal experience saying, “The very name of the ‘Control Top’ underpants suggested they were indeed a disciplining device, a reminder that the fat body must be strictly patrolled and policed” (156). Furthermore, the media constantly “emphasizes that women are defined by [their] bodies” (Douglas). Therefore, the message is not simply that fat itself needs to be tamed, but that fat women need to be disciplined and controlled. Accordingly, society learns “these knowledges, internalize[s] them, and deploy[s] them at an almost pre-conscious level: [society] has a learned negative response to fat bodies, and their aesthetic transgressions” (Murray). Because of this, the fat body is seen as deviant and alien and “in order to be accorded personhood, is expected to engage in a continual process of transformation” (Murray). Consequently, there is a fear equated with the fat body and any body that simply is not thin, encouraging shame and disgust toward these people for living in bodies the media deem as unacceptable.¶ The most important truth in relation to the media is that it is built on myth. “Advertisements work by constructing myths, in such a way as to endow the products with meanings which appear to be natural and eternal” (Gill 49). Advertising myth is also used when weighing people’s physical appearances. However, products eventually break and “beauty” will inevitably fade, because the standard is constantly changing. Wolf states that “modern women are growing, moving, and expressing their individuality, as the myth has it; “beauty” is, by definition, inert, timeless, and generic. That this hallucination is necessary and deliberate is evident in the way “beauty” so directly contradicts women’s real situation” (6). This is also evident because in the 1950s and 1960s the media myth was that women “weren’t changing when they were” and the myth now is that women’s equality “is an accomplished fact when it isn’t” (Douglas 4). If the “perfect lifestyle” is only depicted in these elaborate media-constructed fantasies, then it should be argued that the perfect lifestyle is unattainable because, like media, the foundation for it is also a myth.¶ Contradictory media-constructed myths are abundant, but one of the most common is that people’s health and well-being are the number one priority of advertisers. Media have created an environment that devalues women, masking their concern for sales with feigned concern for women’s happiness. This environment:¶ Is an environment that we all swim in, as fish swim in water. And just as it’s difficult to be healthy in a toxic physical environment, if we’re breathing poisoned air for example, so it’s difficult to be healthy in a ‘toxic cultural environment’ – an environment that surrounds us with unhealthy images and constantly sacrifices our health for the sake of profit. (Killing Us Softly)¶ Proof of this can be found in a study from the 1990s which “indicated that the magazines most often read by women contained ten times the number of advertisements and articles on weight and dieting than the magazines read by men and by the end of the century, between 90 and 85 percent of those who suffered from eating disorders were women” (Gourley 67). Because of these statistics, one could argue that the media actually depend on creating unhealthy thoughts and habits in women, in the hopes of generating profit. If no woman is perfect the way she is, then no woman is excluded from buying into the message. This in turn creates problems rather than fixing them. “The obsession with thinness, the tyranny of the ideal image of beauty…these are public health problems that affect us all and can only be solved by changing the environment” (Killing Us Softly). Therefore, until the harm that media is capable of causing becomes acknowledged, people’s health will continue to be at risk for profit’s sake.¶ Body modification has become a consumer solution to dealing with the environment that the media create. The frightening irony of this is that it actually contributes to the problem and allows more harmful industries to form and flourish. One of the most common forms of body modification is dieting, especially with weight-loss pills. American culture has made it clear that every woman is too big, and dieting has become the norm. The dangers of dieting include the fact that women must fight against their own physiology, diet products are often risky, “they can kill you, and at best, they do not work” (Killing Us Softly). An even more dangerous and dramatic effect is a recent increase in cosmetic surgery procedures. Of these, 91% are performed on women. In fact, during the period of time between 1997 and 2007 the amount of these procedures “rose 457% to almost 12 million per year” (Killing Us Softly). This creates a vicious cycle between the media and the consumer.¶ While the consumer is searching for a solution to nonexistent problems the media create, the consumer is also aiding in allowing trends to develop, making media seem as if their myths are reasonable. What is worse is that the media know exactly the role they are playing. Wolf refers to this as “conscious market manipulation” because “powerful industries – the $33 billion a year diet industry, the $20 billion a year cosmetics industry, the $300 million cosmetic surgery industry” have all developed due to perceived physical flaws and “unconscious anxieties” that are “in turn able, through their influence on mass culture, to use, stimulate, and reinforce the hallucination in a rising economic spiral” (6). The danger of body modification is that bodies are not recyclable, the ideal image of beauty is perpetually changing and fleeting, and trying to keep up with it is both harmful and impossible.¶ When the media gain power, women inevitably lose it. “Since women grow more powerful with time, women’s identity must be premised upon our ‘beauty’, so [they] that we will remain vulnerable to outside approval, carrying the vital sensitive organ of self esteem exposed to the air” (Wolf 4). The ironic aspect of media is that “confident expressions of girl power sit alongside reports of epidemic levels of anorexia among young women” (Gill 1). This is a common occurrence with media, and it must be remembered that even if “stronger images of women have appeared in greater numbers, it does not mean a change in the predominant content of the product” (Raymond 36). The media offer up a false sense of power with the products they sell in exchange for draining people of the power they do have. Gill states that “social relations based on domination, antagonism, and injustice come to be seen as natural, inevitable and even desirable by those who benefit least from them” (54). So while women are encouraged to proclaim independence and power, they are actually being used as a platform for larger media reach and outcome.¶ Another tactic employed by the media used to further strip women of their power is that of objectification and dehumanization. The topic of sex becomes twisted and exploited with women in many ways, from using sex to sell products, to making a woman’s natural human urge for sex taboo and incriminating. Women are supposed to be both virginal and incredibly sexy, a balance that is impossible to pull off. There are also cases of “assumed ‘slutiness’,” when a woman is judged by her presumed sexual activity solely on the basis of her appearance, which can be more readily related to women who are considered unattractive or young girls whose bodies develop early on (Raiten-D’Antonio 111). The danger with assumed slutiness is that it is not based in fact, but it is anchored in hate. Carolyn Kitch writes about the “True Woman,” who is a woman of virtue, and the “Vamp,” who is sexual, powerful, and emasculating. She found that “the vamp was ‘posed as the True Woman’s opposite. She is dark, she is sexual, she is volatile, and above all, she lives alone, outside the sphere of home and family’” (61). Women are caught between the balancing act of innocence versus experience, and the assumptions about their sexual activity can actually lead to assumptions of being dangerous and unworthy of human interaction.¶ The media use objectification to normalize misperceptions of women within advertising. Instead of being portrayed as diverse human beings, “women’s bodies are dismembered in ads; hacked apart” so that people will only focus on certain parts at one time (Killing Us Softly). Women’s bodies are “presented simply as a composite of problems, each requiring a product-solution” which is the most profound yet readily accepted form of objectification in the media (Gill 80). The fear of one’s physical appearance must then be heavily balanced with that of one’s physiological desires. The media take objectification far beyond simply equating a woman’s body with a thing, and instead actually turn women into objects that must go through a rigorous routine of perpetual upkeep.¶ Women’s voices are continually silenced by the media, because they would rather women be seen and not heard. “Social order feel[s] the need to defend itself by evading the face of real women, our faces and voices and bodies, and reducing the meaning of women to those formulaic and endlessly reproduced “beautiful” images”(Wolf 7). This erases real women, their lived experiences, and their worth. When women are not given a space by the media, they are being told that they do not deserve recognition as people. However, the women who are pictured in the media are not afforded the dignity of a voice. Women, in turn, are afraid to speak up in a culture that prefers their looks over their words. This message is reinforced in advertisements where girls have their hands over their mouths. Many of these advertisements have accompanying text with phrases like “score high on nonverbal skills!” While similar advertisements with pictures of girls who are “incredibly thin” and have body language that makes it look like they are “trying to disappear” claim “the more you subtract, the more you add” (Killing Us Softly). Media is then enforcing the idea that the less a girl speaks, or the thinner the girl is, the more she will be worth. Therefore, media are not only silencing women, but are simultaneously telling women to silence and erase themselves.¶ The final wave of effect caused by all of these issues is violence and ultimately death. Although “adverts don’t directly cause violence,” they do “contribute to a state of terror” because “turning a human being into a thing, an object, is almost always the first step to justifying violence against that person” and “this step is already taken with women” (Killing Us Softly). Being portrayed negatively is not the only cause for violence, however. Being erased by the media and not being given a space at all certainly contributes. Toni Raiten-D’Antonio says that “those inclined to be hostile and controlling” can sense when someone feels erased or has a low self-regard, and those people are more likely to be targeted for abuse. “In many cases of sexual harassment or sexual assault, the perpetrator says the victim was ugly and either deserved [it] what she got or actually welcomed the attention because she couldn’t otherwise attract anyone’s interest” (130). These types of events [of] can be referred to as “female disposability” which can also be found in headlines that “capitalize on the sensational aspects of serial killings of sex workers.” Although these tabloids bring these women’s stories into the light, it is only to “paint them with a broad and dehumanizing brush” (Stillman 492). When women are refused personhood by the media and instead women’s worth is equated to their physical appearance, violence or worse is inevitable. The seemingly harmless media that exist to monopolize on women’s beauty then become these women’s worst nightmare.¶ The media [is] are a business that [relies] rely on people, and like any business, their purpose is to create opportunities for generating profit. The problem lies within the way people, most especially women, are treated by the media as products rather than human beings worthy of dignity, personhood, and respect. The media use discrimination, objectification, and dehumanization to police women’s bodies. The result of this is a rise in low self-esteem, dangerous body modification procedures, violence, and sometimes death among women. As long as women’s bodies continue to be shunned instead of celebrated by the media, these negative effects will persist.

## UV

#### CX checks abuse – prefer it:

1. There are infinite interps that I have to answer, but all have potential of winning rounds for you, especially if they’re NIBs for me.
2. You can and should use CX for clarification especially if the implication is that I’d lose without you knowing.
3. CX gets us back to substance quicker. When possible, prefer substance since it’s both more predictable and easier to adjudicate.
4. The implication of theory is vote for the better debater, but that doesn’t imply the better theory debater – clearly substance is important.

#### Solutions to critical issues must be discussed through pragmatic approaches within hegemonic power structures. Kapoor ‘08

Kapoor, 2008 (Ilan, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, “The Postcolonial Politics of Development,” p. 138-139)

There are perhaps several other social movement campaigns that could be cited as examples of a ‘hybridizing strategy’.5 But what emerges as important from the Chipko and NBA campaigns is the way in which they treat laws and policies, institutional practices, and ideological apparatuses as deconstructible. That is, they refuse to take dominant authority at face value, and proceed to reveal its contingencies. Sometimes, they expose what the hegemon is trying to disavow or hide (exclusion of affected communities in project design and implementation, faulty information gathering and dissemination). Sometimes, they problematize dominant or naturalized truths (‘development = unlimited economic growth = capitalism’, ‘big is better’, ‘technology can save the environment’). In either case, by contesting, publicizing, and politicizing accepted or hidden truths, they hybridize power, challenging its smugness and triumphalism, revealing its impurities. They show power to be, literally and figuratively, a bastard. While speaking truth to power, a hybridizing strategy also exploits the instabilities of power. In part, this involves showing up and taking advantage of the equivocations of power — conflicting laws, contradictory policies, unfulfilled promises. A lot has to do here with publicly shaming the hegemon, forcing it to remedy injustices and live up to stated commitments in a more accountable and transparent manner. And, in part, this involves nurturing or manipulating the splits and strains within institutions. Such maneuvering can take the form of cultivating allies, forging alliances, or throwing doubt on prevailing orthodoxy. Note, lastly, the way in which a hybridizing strategy works with the dominant discourse. This reflects the negotiative aspect of Bhabha’s performativity. The strategy may outwit the hegemon, but it does so from the interstices of the hegemony. The master may be paralyzed, but his paralysis is induced using his own poison/medicine. It is for this reason that cultivating allies in the adversarial camp is possible: when you speak their language and appeal to their own ethical horizons, you are building a modicum of common ground. It is for this reason also that the master cannot easily dismiss or crush you. Observing his rules and playing his game makes it difficult for him not to take you seriously or grant you a certain legitimacy. The use of non-violent tactics may be crucial in this regard: state repression is easily justified against violent adversaries, but it is vulnerable to public criticism when used against non-violence. Thus, the fact that Chipko and the NBA deployed civil disobedience — pioneered, it must be pointed out, by the ‘father of the nation’ (i.e. Gandhi) — made it difficult for the state to quash them or deflect their claims.
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### ROB O/W

1. Scope, Wilson 11 says that gendered marketing is the most wide-scale form of cultural reinforcement of oppressive norms that produces oppression in the real world. Building solutions to these issues are key.

2. Specificity, Niccolini 15 says we must create counter pedagogies to the squp conceptions of women within academic spheres which means I also control uniqueness, you can talk about x is other forums.

3. Prior question, Chapman 11 says gendered marketing reduces women into a product, a form of dehumanization which means the aff is also a question of the ontological precepts of women in the squo.

4. Secrecy, Chapman 11 says the ads permeate our thought without us even knowing, creating stereotypes that we don’t recognize to exist, the sexism will just continue absent things like the AC.

### AT They will just sell bigger guns

1. CA Volokh 09, says that Americans consider handguns to be the quintessential self-defense weapon which is exactly what the NRA is marketing towards

2. CA Glick 15 NRA tries to markets handguns to women as being cute and matchable with certain accessories, they can’t do that with long guns

4. Even if they do sell bigger guns, those efforts will fail, since those guns aren’t concealable and they are way more expensive

### They will advertise in other ways

1. This argument is offensive, it suggests we shouldn’t fight against oppression because oppressors will find other ways to oppress, that’s ridiculous.

2. They can’t, we deck their #1 source of profit, they aren’t going to be able to advertise.

3. Those practices are going to be ineffective since the handgun is key to self-defense, that’s Volokh 09

#### Terminal Defense - no substitution effect – three reasons: handguns are preferable since they’re more concealable, cost less since they’re smaller and more common, and felons would move to knives or fists before they’d move to more dangerous guns since they don’t need bigger guns and a knife would serve the same function.

#### Author bias, Kates is not a scientific article nor is searching for truth. Hemenway 09:

Hemenway, David. (Hemenway, Ph.D., is an economist and director of the Harvard Injury Control Research Center and the Harvard Youth Violence Prevention Center. A former Pew Fellow on Injury Control, he was a Senior Soros Justice Fellow and held a Robert Wood Johnson Investigator Award in Health Policy Research) "Review "Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A Review of International and Some Domestic Evidence"" Rev. of Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A Review of International and Some Domestic Evidence, by Don B. Kates and Gary Mauser. Harvard School of Public Health (2009): n. pag. Print. BS

The article appears in a publication, described as a "student law review for conservative and libertarian¶ legal scholarship.” It does not appear to be a peer-reviewed journal, or one that is searching for truth as¶ opposed to presenting a certain world view. The paper itself is not a scientific article, but a polemic,¶ making the claim that gun availability does not affect homicide or suicide. It does this by ignoring most¶ of the scientific literature, and by making too many incorrect and illogical claims. Here I will discuss just¶ a few of the many problems with the paper.

#### Handguns are used in self-defense in less than 1% of cases and are almost never effective.

Donohue 15. John Donohue, John Donohue is one of the leading empirical researchers in the legal academy over the past 25 years. Professor Donohue is an economist as well as a lawyer and is well known for using empirical analysis to determine the impact of law and public policy in a wide range of areas, including civil rights and antidiscrimination law, employment discrimination, crime and criminal justice, and school funding. He has a BA from Hamilton College, a JD from Harvard Law School, and a PhD in economics from Yale. August 27, 2015, “Ban guns, end shootings? How evidence stacks up around the world”, <http://www.cnn.com/2015/08/27/opinions/us-guns-evidence/> **\*\*we object to the “victim” rhetoric\*\***

For starters, only the tiniest fraction of ~~victims~~ of violent crime are able to use a gun in their defense. Over the period from 2007-2011, when roughly six million nonfatal violent crimes occurred each year, data from the National Crime Victimization Survey show that the ~~victim~~ did not defend with a gun in 99.2% of these incidents -- this in a country with 300 million guns in civilian hands. In fact, a study of 198 cases of unwanted entry into occupied single-family dwellings in Atlanta (not limited to night when the residents were sleeping) found that the invader was twice as likely to obtain the ~~victim's~~ gun than to have the ~~victim~~ use a firearm in self-defense. The author of the study, Arthur Kellerman, concluded in words that Justice Thomas and Scalia might well heed: On average, the gun that represents the greatest threat is the one that is kept loaded and readily available in a bedside drawer. A loaded, unsecured gun in the home is like an insurance policy that fails to deliver at least 95% of the time you need it, but has the constant potential -- particularly in the case of handguns that are more easily manipulated by children and more attractive for use in crime -- to harm someone in the home or (via theft) the public at large.

#### Giroux sucks

**Crawford 97** [Alice, Department of Communication, University of Pittsburgh, 1997, “Critique and reproduction of civic humanist pedagogy in Henry Giroux's Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life”, Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy, 11:3-4, 315-327]

1. First objective: save the spheres! The first objective of the civic humanist agenda involves a concern with the public sphere, that much-longed-for space in which free citizens once allegedly gathered to speak openly about their political concerns, and in which other citizens actually listened to them. The quest to (re) create such a space is the prime directive for the civic humanists, as the public sphere is the place in which the civic arts are practiced. The civic humanist attempt to contribute to this re-expansion, or at least preservation is, importantly, couched in the language of democracy. The spheres of discourse in which deliberation takes place are those of the democratic state, not newly forged spaces; the public sphere that needs revitalization is a democratic public sphere. Giroux shares the civic humanists' concern with the public sphere, and pays particular attention to the school itself as such a place, rather than as merely a preparatory field for the real world. The task of the educator is, in Giroux's eyes, as follows: to struggle collectively as transformative intellectuals, that is, as educators who have a social vision and commitment to make public schools democratic spheres, where all children, regardless of race, class, gender, and age can learn what it means to be able to participate fully in a society that affirms and sustains the principles of equality, freedom, and social justice.4 The preparatory role of the school is still important however; students are learning to participate in a society that transcends the boundaries of the enlightened schoolyard, and, if this society is not already a place in which they may all participate fully, Giroux would have them join in effecting the appropriate transformation: the call for the development of democratic public spheres outside colleges of education [and other schools] points to the need to reconstruct a cultural politics in which educators and other intellectuals develop a public voice and become part of any one of a number of social movements in which they can put their theoretical and pedagogical skills to use in building historical blocs capable of emancipatory social change In the use of' reconstructing' here and elsewhere, we can see that Giroux, like the civic humanists, indulges in a bit of nostalgia for more politically involved times. Like the civic humanists described by Fusfield, Giroux believes that what is needed to vitalize—or revitalize—democracy, is 'the (re)vitalization of spheres of discourse where open public deliberation through speech-making is still possible.'6 Giroux quotes Thomas Ferguson to this effect: the prerequisites for effective democracy are not really automatic voter registration or even Sunday voting, though these would help. Rather, deeper institutional forces—flourishing unions, readily accessible third parties, inexpensive media, and a thriving network of cooperatives and community organizations—are the real basis of effective democracy.' Unions, third parties, and other networks are some of Giroux's 'counterpublic spheres' (under which rubric he also includes churches and journals) that he believes educators, as transformative intellectuals, need to recognize as important sites for citizenship education, as he commends Dewey and other social reconstructionists for doing.8 He intends to follow their lead in seeking a larger and more active role for educators in developing spaces in which oppositional discourse can flourish. There is implicit in this concern with the public sphere that it is the arena in which the individual is both able and obliged to find meaning and purpose. In Fusfield's words: They are concerned... to preserve the deliberative voice—and therewith personal integrity—of ordinary citizens in a modern—and now postmodern—society which, in numerous ways, has become increasingly inimical to hearing such voices and granting such integrity.8 Without the opportunity to define oneself through activity in the public sphere, i.e. to exercise one's deliberative voice, one's life is allegedly impoverished in important ways ; in its absence, one disintegrates. ' Citizenship' is Giroux's name for that activity which we engage in within the public sphere in order to transcend the limits of the privatelydefined self, and he contrasts his definition against the Right's conception of citizenship in which this transcendence is displaced by the imperatives of the state: citizenship in this case becomes a process of dialogue and commitment rooted in a fundamental belief in the possibility of public life and the development of forms of solidarity that allow people to reflect and organize in order to criticize and constrain the power of the state and to overthrow relations which inhibit and prevent the realization of humanity}0 (italics mine) This concern leaves Giroux open to a number of critiques. For example, one could argue that he shares the following assumption that Fusfield attributes to the civic humanists: universal political participation is always both necessary and desirable... no social problems can be ameliorated by the workings of interested representative politics or the operation of a capitalist market.11 That Giroux expresses an interest in what he terms counterpublic spheres might seem to weaken this critique, but in fact strengthens it, since the counterpublic spheres such as labor unions, churches, neighborhood organizations, journals, and so on are, in Giroux's view, to organize themselves around this same concern with public life. 2. The persistence of civic humanist rhetoric The affinity of Giroux's project to that of civic humanism can also be detected in the vocabulary used to describe it. Giroux's project is formulated through concepts such as citizenship, patriotism, public responsibility, democracy, and other mainstays of civic humanist discourse. Although he insists that the terms need to be problematized, the solutions he proposes are entirely within the bounds of democracy, which simply needs to be revitalized as a model for public life, rather than superseded or thrown out. This concern with democracy poses a real problem if one believes, as Fusfield claims, that democratic forms of public life have been superseded in the postmodern, postdemocratic world in which we live. On this view, Giroux, like the civic humanists, is concerned with the preservation of a political discourse and way of life that no longer exists. This condition has been described by Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner as 'future shock': Future shock occurs when you are confronted by the fact that the world you were educated to believe in doesn't exist. Your images of reality are apparitions that disappear on contact. There are several ways of responding to such a condition, one of which is to withdraw and allow oneself to be overcome by a sense of impotence. More commonly, one continues to act as if his apparitions were substantial, relentlessly pursuing a course of action that he knows will fail him. You may have noticed that there are scores of political, social and religious leaders who are clearly suffering from advanced cases of future shock. They repeat over and over again the words that are supposed to represent the world about them. But nothing seems to work out. And then they repeat the words again and again.12 Fusfield has ascribed this second response to the civic humanists and I would argue that it can also be detected in Giroux. One could, of course, take this further and say that, not only are the civic humanists and Giroux nostalgic for a premodern (and a fortiori pre-postmodern) form of life, they are nostalgic for a way of life that never existed in the first place. Such nostalgia disregards the uncomfortable fact that in the Greek polis, or in the early American town meetings, the model public spheres of the past, the discourse that took place was far from democratic in any radical sense of the word. These spheres existed as places of freedom only in the context of a larger system of domination and exclusion that sustained them. In light of this, Giroux and the civic humanists can both be described as worshipping a cultural simulacrum.